

UDC (UO'K, YDK) 821512

AMBIGUITY AND CLASSIFICATION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF BAHUVRIHIS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK¹¹

Rakhimova Shodiya Shukhrat qizi

English teacher

Ranch Technology university

Urgench, Khorezm.

e-mail: r.shodiyy@gmail.com

Orcid ID: [0000000315290162](https://orcid.org/0000000315290162)

mob: +998957550518

ABSTRACT

This article examines bahuvrihis, a specific type of attribute compound word, in English and Uzbek and examines their formation, semantics and classification through a comparative lens. Based on cognitive linguistics and construction grammar, the study examines how these compounds are constructed, focusing on their figurative and metonymic meanings, and the inherent ambiguities in distinguishing them from other word combinations, especially in Uzbek. A central argument is the lack of clear and consistent criteria for bahuvrihi classification in Uzbek lexicography, exemplified by the inconsistent treatment of forms like “og‘iroyoq” (heavy foot/pregnant) in the “O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati”. This article analyzes diverse perspectives on compound word formation in both languages, highlighting the descriptive function of bahuvrihis in characterizing human attributes, appearance, and personality, often with cultural or social connotations. In addition, the article takes into account orthographic and phonetic variations in the treatment of compound words between the two languages. By exploring the etymology and unique characteristics of bahuvrihis, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of Uzbek lexicology and underscores the need for further research using corpus analysis and psycholinguistic methods to establish more precise definitions and classification rules for Uzbek compound words, an area that requires further development compared to its English counterpart. Numerous examples from both languages illustrate the analysis.

KEY WORDS

Attributive
compound words,
bahuvrihi (exocentric
compound), compound
words, word formation,
metonymy, figurative
language, comparative
linguistics.

Received: February 7,
2025

Accepted: March 1,
2024

Available online: May 2,
2025

¹¹ **For citation (Iqtibos keltirish uchun, для цитирования):**

Rakhimova Sh. Ambiguity and classification: A comparative analysis of bahuvrihis in English and Uzbek. // Komparativistika (Comparative Studies). — 2025. — Vol.2, № 2(6) — B. 143-161

IKKI MA'NOLILIK VA TASNIFLASH: INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDAGI BAHUVRIHI BIRIKMALARINING QIYOSIY TAHLILI

Rahimova Shodiya Shuxrat qizi

Ingliz tili o'qituvchisi

Ranch Texnologiya universiteti

Urganch, Xorazm

e-mail: r.shodiy@gmail.com

moʻb: +998957550518

[Orcid ID: 0000000315290162](https://orcid.org/0000000315290162)

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada bahuvrihilarni, aniqlovchi birikma soʻzlarning oʻziga xos turini, ingliz va oʻzbek tillarida ularning shakllanishi, semantikasi va tasnifini qiyosiy nuqtayi nazardan oʻrganiladi. Kognitiv lingvistika va konstruksiya grammatikasi asosidagi tadqiqot ushbu birikmalarining qanday tuzilishini, ularning majoziy va metonimik maʼnolariga, shuningdek, ularni boshqa soʻz birikmalaridan, ayniqsa oʻzbek tilida ajratishdagi noaniqliklarni oʻrganadi. Asosiy muammo shundaki, oʻzbek leksikografiyasida bahuvrihi tasnifi uchun aniq va izchil mezonlar yetishmaydi, bunga “Oʻzbek tilining izohli lugʻati”da “ogʻiroyoq” (“ogʻir oyoq”/“homilador”) shakllarining nomutanosib tarzda koʻrib chiqilishi misol boʻla oladi. Ushbu maqolada har ikki tilda birikma soʻzlar yasash boʻyicha turli nuqtayi nazarlarni tahlil qilinadi shuningdek, bahuvrihilarning inson sifatleri, tashqi koʻrinishi va shaxsiyatini, koʻpincha madaniy yoki ijtimoiy maʼnolari bilan tavsiflashdagi deskriptiv funksiyasini taʼkidlaydi. Bundan tashqari, maqola har ikki tilda birikma soʻzlarning qoʻllanilishidagi orfografik va fonetik oʻzgarishlarni koʻrib chiqadi. Bahuvrihilarning etimologiyasi va oʻziga xos xususiyatlarini oʻrganish orqali, ushbu tadqiqot oʻzbek leksikologiyasini yanada nozik tushunishga hissa qoʻshadi, oʻzbek birikma soʻzlari uchun aniqroq taʼriflar va tasniflash qoidalarini yaratish uchun korpus tahlili va psixolingvistik metodlardan foydalangan holda qoʻshimcha tadqiqotlar zarurligini taʼkidlaydi, bu soha ingliz tilidagi birikma soʻzlarni oʻrganishga nisbatan kamroq rivojlangan. Har ikki tildan koʻplab misollar orqali tahliliy xulosalar koʻrsatiladi.

KALIT SOʻZLAR

Sifatlovchi

qoʻshma soʻzlar, bahuvrihi (ekzosentrik qoʻshma soʻz), qoʻshma soʻzlar, soʻz yasash, metonimiya, majoziy til, qiyosiy tilshunoslik.

ДВУСМЫСЛЕННОСТЬ И КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ БАХУВРИХИ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ.

Рахимова Шодия Шухрат кизи

Преподаватель английского языка

Ургенчский технологический университет

Ургенч, Хорезм.

e-mail: r.shodiyy@gmail.com

моб: +998957550518

[Orcid ID: 0000000315290162](https://orcid.org/0000000315290162)

АННОТАЦИЯ

В данной статье исследуются бахуврихи (особый тип атрибутивных сложных слов) в английском и узбекском языках, в сравнительном аспекте рассматриваются их образование, семантика и классификация. Опираясь на когнитивную лингвистику и конструкционную грамматику, в ходе исследования было изучено, как строятся эти сложные слова, рассмотрены их образные и метонимические значения, а также вопрос об отсутствии единого подхода к их разграничению от других словосочетаний, особенно в узбекском языке. Главная причина заключается в неразработанности в узбекской лексикографии четких и последовательных критериев для классификации бахуврихи, что иллюстрируется непоследовательным рассмотрением таких форм, как 'og'igoyoq' ('тяжелоголая'/'беременная') в «Толковом словаре узбекского языка». В данной статье анализируются различные точки зрения на образование сложных слов в обоих сравниваемых языках, подчеркивается описательная функция бахуврихи в характеристике человеческих качеств, внешности и личности, часто с культурными или социальными коннотациями. Кроме того, в статье рассматриваются орфографические и фонетические вариации в употреблении сложных слов в обоих языках. Изучая этимологию и уникальные характеристики бахуврихи, данное исследование вносит вклад в более глубокое понимание нюансов узбекской лексикологии и подчеркивает необходимость дальнейших исследований с использованием корпусного анализа и психолингвистических методов для выработки более точных определений, и принципов классификации узбекских сложных слов – области, требующей дальнейшего развития по сравнению с их английскими аналогами. Проведенный анализ иллюстрируют многочисленные примеры из обоих языков.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА

Атрибутивные сложные слова, бахуврихи (экзоцентрические сложные слова), сложное словообразование, метонимия, образный язык, сопоставительное языкознание.

INTRODUCTION

The study of bahuvrihis is significant because it reveals the complex processes of word formation and semantic change and reveals how languages create new meanings through the interaction of existing lexical elements. Understanding these processes contributes to a deeper understanding of language structure and development. Compound words, formed by the combination of two or more lexical elements, are a ubiquitous feature of languages around the world and play a crucial role in expanding vocabulary and expressing complex concepts. These formations present fascinating challenges for linguistic analysis, particularly in classification, semantic interpretation, and differentiation from other multi-word units. This article focuses on a specific type of compound word known as the “bahuvrihi” (also referred to as an exocentric compound), which exhibits unique semantic properties. A figurative or metonymic meaning characterizes Bahuvrihis, which is not directly predictable from the literal meanings of their constituent parts. Instead, the compound refers to something distinct, often a person characterized by a feature implied by the components. For instance, the English example “egghead” signifies a clever person, not someone with an egg-shaped head. This characteristic shift in meaning makes bahuvrihis a particularly interesting area of study. This article undertakes a comparative investigation of bahuvrihis in English and Uzbek, two languages with distinct typological profiles and historical influences. While both languages employ bahuvrihi-like constructions, their frequency, formation patterns, and semantic nuances may differ significantly. This comparative lens enables us to explore the cross-linguistic variations in the way this specific type of compound works and sheds light on the underlying cognitive processes involved in the construction of meaning. In addition, the article examines the challenges of classifying bahuvrihis, especially in Uzbek, where the distinction between compound words and word combinations can be ambiguous. Drawing on the work of prominent linguists, including both Russian and Uzbek scholars, we will examine the different theoretical perspectives on compound word formation and analyze how these perspectives apply to the specific case of bahuvrihis. A key aim is to address

the inconsistencies and lack of clear criteria in the classification of Uzbek compound words, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of Uzbek lexicology.

Through a detailed analysis of examples from both English and Uzbek, this study seeks to illuminate the semantic intricacies of bahuvrihis, highlight the challenges in their classification, and ultimately contribute to a more refined theoretical framework for understanding compound word formation across languages. Compound words are formed in various ways in every language and studied in different ways. This idea can be proven by analyzing materials from Uzbek, Russian, German, and English languages. “In both Uzbek and English, compound words, one of which is determinative compound words, and on the basis of which our subject of research, “bahuvrihis”, are considered, have their own specific characteristics of study.” (Rakhimova Sh.Sh., 2020, 7.) It is worth noting that linguists who studied these two languages - English and Uzbek - thoroughly dealt with “bahuvrihis”, analyzed the topic to the best of their. Of course, it is natural that there may be certain similarities and differences in the interpretation of the topic. Before moving on to the analysis of opinions, comments and conclusions expressed by them regarding “bahuvrihis”, we will dwell in more detail on the interpretation of compound words in these languages, in particular the determinative forms of compound words and their significance in the language.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of compound words, including the specific category of bahuvrihis, has a rich history in linguistics, drawing on contributions from both Russian and Uzbek scholarship. Early work, like K.A. Levkovskaya’s emphasis on the interplay of syntax and lexicon in compounding, laid the theoretical groundwork for later investigations. (Levkovskaya, 1954, p. 18) This syntactic-lexical approach is echoed in B. Madaliyev’s classification of Uzbek compound words, which includes formations arising from the combination of words without suffixes. His work is crucial for understanding Uzbek compounding, particularly his focus on the evolution of word combinations into compound words through semantic and

structural shifts, and his criteria for defining compound words as combinations of roots expressing a unified concept. (Madaliyev B., 1958, 7.) However, the application of these criteria, as evidenced by inconsistencies in the “O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati” (Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language), reveals a persistent ambiguity in distinguishing compound words from word combinations, particularly when considering bahuvrihis. These exocentric compounds, with their figurative meanings, present a unique challenge. While the scientist touches on their formation, later research has explored their attributive function and metonymic nature, emphasizing the disconnect between the literal meanings of components and the overall figurative meaning. Our focus on the descriptive role of bahuvrihis in characterizing people is particularly relevant to this study. While the literature acknowledges bahuvrihis in both English and Uzbek, a dedicated cross-linguistic analysis is often lacking. This article aims to address this gap by comparing and contrasting bahuvrihi formation, semantics, and usage in English and Uzbek, building upon existing theoretical frameworks, and addressing unresolved issues of classification and semantic interpretation in Uzbek lexicology.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a comparative, descriptive approach to analyze bahuvrihi compound words in English and Uzbek. The research draws on existing linguistic literature, including the works of Madaliyev and Hojiyev and others, which provide theoretical frameworks for understanding compound word formation and the specific characteristics of bahuvrihis. (Hojiyev A., Abdurahmonov G‘.A., Tursunov U., Muxtorov A., Rahmatullayev Sh.) Data for the analysis were collected from several sources. Uzbek examples were primarily drawn from the “O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati” (Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language) supplemented by examples from linguistic works and common usage. English examples were selected from standard English dictionaries (The Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary 7th edition., Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary., Michael Rundell. Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners of American English.) and recognized

linguistic resources, including examples discussed in the literature. (Sidney Greenbaum., Sweet H., Bauer Laurie.) The analysis proceeded in two stages. First, the formation and semantic properties of bahuvrihis in each language were examined individually, focusing on their structure, metonymic meanings, and usage patterns. Second, a comparative analysis was conducted to identify similarities and differences in the ways bahuvrihis are formed and used in English and Uzbek. Special attention was paid to the challenges of classifying bahuvrihis and distinguishing them from other word combinations, particularly in Uzbek, where inconsistencies in existing classifications were noted. The analysis also considered orthographic and phonetic criteria, where relevant, comparing how these factors influence the recognition and interpretation of compound words in the two languages. The findings of this analysis are then discussed in relation to broader theoretical questions about compound word formation and cross-linguistic variation in semantic change. It is known that words are combined and form phrases as a result of words interacting with each other based on certain grammatical and semantic rules. Such phrases, in the process of the development and evolution of languages, with the passage of certain periods, can become a single syntactic unit in phonetic, grammatical, and semantic terms, or compound words can be formed. Indeed, in all languages of the world, including English and Uzbek, word formation by a purely syntactic method has not been observed. This idea was emphasized in due time by the Russian scientist K.A. Levkovskaya, who stated, “The phenomenon of compound word formation by a purely syntactic method (чисто синтаксическое словообразование) is impossible in language!” (Levkovskaya K.A., 1954, 18.) The Uzbek linguist B. Madaliyev shows that compound words in our national language are formed in 3 different ways:

1. Compound words formed by the syntactic-lexical method.
2. Compound words formed by the syntactic-morphological method.
3. Compound words formed by the morphological method. (Madaliyev B., 1958, 8)

According to the scholar's explanation, word combinations formed with the help of the syntactic-lexical method, without using any word-forming suffixes, at a

certain stage of the language's development, the connections between them weaken or become more concise. As a result, the components of word combinations combine in one semantic center, forming a grammatically and phonetically unified whole. At the end of this process, new compound words appear, for example, *dalamudir* and *oshpichoq*. Likewise, specific compound words, such as bahuvrihis, for example, *chalasavod* or *kaltafahm*, are shown by the scholar as compound words formed by the syntactic-lexical method.

The scholar envisions two main processes in creating compound words of this type: firstly, word combinations that arise from the interaction of more than one word based on certain grammatical rules. This process is mainly considered syntactic. Secondly, with a change in the meaning of these word combinations, they become a new compound word, considered a lexical process. The emergence of new meanings and structures through these processes contributes to the enrichment of the language. Combining these two moments, he approves that it is appropriate to call this type of compound word formation syntactic-lexical.

The assessment of whether words borrowed from other languages into the Uzbek language are compound or simple words by Uzbek linguists is also different. Our linguists emphasize that if each component of the borrowed word serves as an independent root in the Uzbek language, such borrowings (such as *xushxabar*, *kamdiydor*, *dilorom*) (O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati., 2006, 1-5-jildlar) can be considered compound words.

"If one of the components does not appear as an independent root in the Uzbek language, such borrowings (like *kamnamo*, *dilnavoz*) cannot be included in the category of compound words. B. Madaliyev provides a more precise explanation in this regard: "Words are considered compound words when they are formed from the combination of two or more words (roots) and express a unified concept - meaning." (Madaliyev B., 1958, 16.) He emphasizes that compound words can also be formed through certain affixes: "Some compound words are also formed with elements such as *-aro*, *-simon*, *-parvar*, *-furush*, *-do 'z*, *-xo 'r*." It is noted in the above works that if compound words formed with these elements take on a figurative (metonymic)

meaning and refer to a person, their transformation into bahuvrihis remains beyond consideration.”

In this regard, the ideas of Russian linguists N. M. Shansky, V. R. Grigoryev, K. A. Levkovskaya, A. S. Akhmanova, A. I. Smirnitsky, V. I. Alatilyev, and also Uzbek linguists B. Madaliyev, N. Mamatov, Sh. Rahmatullayev, A. Gulomov, A. Khodjiyev, regarding compound words, their origin, the morphological, syntactic, and lexical relations between their components, and their distinction from word combinations, are noteworthy.

The works of these scientists are remarkable in that the idea of one continues and complements the other, explaining the essence of the issue more clearly. For example, although B. Madaliyev does not give a precise definition of word combinations, he gives a concise and clear explanation of compound words. However, interference occurred in the classification of compound words, in the process of dividing them into groups for study. The morphological (form), syntactic (meaning combination), and semantic (meaning expression) aspects of compound words are given together (combined), and the difference between them is unclear. In our opinion, it would be more appropriate to study compound words morphologically and semantically-syntactically. From a morphological point of view, it is necessary to study which parts of speech the components of a compound word belong to, and from a semantic-syntactic point of view, their mutual semantic connection should be studied. For example, morphologically *belbogʻ* - waist (noun) + tie (noun); *oqsoch* (servant) - white (adjective) + hair (noun), *uchburchak* - (rectangular) three (number) + corner (noun). From a semantic-syntactic point of view, in determinative compound words *bel* - determiner (subordinate), *bogʻ* - determined (dominant); *oq* - determiner (subordinate), *soch* - determined (dominant); in copulative compound words *soddashayton*, *achchiqchuchuk* - in these examples there is no determiner-determined relationship, subordinate-dominant relationship, each component fully preserves its meaning synthetically-semantically. “Our views on the classification of compound words in the Uzbek language have not yet fully reached the scientific community; they are new. We have

also not encountered cases where clear rules are provided regarding the distinction between word combinations and compound words in our language. Until now, some linguistic units are sometimes interpreted and written as compound words and sometimes as word combinations. For example, in the “Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language,” the linguistic unit *’og’iroyoq* (heavy-footed/pregnant) is written separately as *’og’ir oyoq* (heavy foot) (O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati., 2006, 1-5 jildlar) and given as a word combination, and on the same page, it is explained as a compound word in the sense of *’og’iroyoq*, that is, pregnant, and it is commented that “the second compound word variant is more correct and acceptable on the same page.” In both cases, it is unclear why these linguistic units are written separately and why they are written together, or whether there is a change or difference in meaning when they are written together or separately.” (Rahimova Sh. Sh., 2018, 56.)

DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek bahuvrihis reveals distinct patterns and challenges in their formation, semantics, and classification.

Formation: English bahuvrihis frequently combine nouns and adjectives (e.g. *egghead*, *loudmouth*), often implying personality traits or physical characteristics. Uzbek bahuvrihis, while also utilizing noun-adjective combinations (e.g., *qirqoyoq* - centipede), demonstrate a wider range of structural patterns, sometimes incorporating other parts of speech. This suggests potential typological differences in compounding strategies between the two languages.

Semantics: Both English and Uzbek bahuvrihis exhibit a characteristic metonymic shift, where the figurative meaning is not directly derivable from the literal components. For instance, an *egghead* signifies intelligence, not an egg-shaped head. Similarly, *qirqoyoq* (centipede) literally means ‘forty legs’ but refers to an insect. However, the specific semantic domains covered by bahuvrihis may differ, reflecting cultural and conceptual variations. Further analysis of a larger corpus would be needed to fully explore these nuances.

Classification: A key finding of this study is the ambiguity surrounding the classification of Uzbek bahuvrihis. The “O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati” inconsistently treats certain forms, sometimes listing them as compound words (written together) and other times as word combinations (written separately), even when referring to the same concept. A prime example is *og‘iroyoq*, which can be interpreted as either ‘heavy foot’ (word combination) or ‘pregnant’ (compound word/bahuvrihi). This inconsistency highlights the need for clearer classification criteria in Uzbek lexicography. In contrast, English bahuvrihi classification is generally more straightforward, although borderline cases may exist.

Orthographic and Phonetic Considerations: Do the compound words have different accepted spellings (e.g. solid, hyphenated, or separate)? This variation can affect how readily a compound word is recognized as a single unit versus a phrase. For example, “blackboard” (solid), “black-board” (hyphenated), and “black board” (separate) can all represent the same concept, but the different spellings might influence how a reader perceives them. I examined whether such variations exist and if they correlate with any semantic or grammatical differences. While not a primary focus, orthographic differences were observed. English bahuvrihis display variations in spelling (e.g. solid, hyphenated, or separate), while Uzbek bahuvrihis generally follow more consistent orthographic rules. Phonetic differences, particularly regarding stress placement, also distinguish the two languages, with English typically stressing the first component and Uzbek the last.

In our opinion, such issues under consideration in linguistics should be studied more deeply by the scientific community, and more extensive explanations should be given regarding these problems. In Western European languages, the characteristics of dividing compound words into various categories according to their semantic content can also be observed in Uzbek. For example, compound words like *‘temirqoziq’* (iron peg) or *‘yog‘ochqoziq’* (wooden peg) are two-components. The first defining component specifies that the second component – *‘qoziq’* (peg) – is made of iron or wood, so they can be considered characteristic of attributive compound words. There is no basis whatsoever to object to this.

Likewise, when we analyze the compound word '*temir-beton*' (reinforced concrete), we can see that it does not fall into the category of copulative compound words, because both components retain their meaning, and together they express one concept - information about a certain material. It is impossible to ask what kind of iron or concrete these components are, because they provide a single concept, that is, information that describes a specific thing. Therefore, when studying compound words, it is necessary to analyze their structure and semantic essence more deeply.

As we mentioned above, compound words in English are studied in 4 groups from a semantic-syntactic point of view. Below, we will analyze English compound words based on their internal features.

Phonetic Criterion. English compound words differ from Uzbek compound words in terms of word stress. The biggest difference is that the main stress in English is the first component of the compound word, while in Uzbek, the main stress is the last syllable of the second component of the compound word. Usually, compound words in both English and Uzbek take two stresses – main and secondary stress: *blackboard* – black (main stress), board (secondary stress), *dumbhead* – dumb (main stress), head (secondary stress); in Uzbek, the opposite is true: *qoradoska* – qora (secondary stress), doska (main stress), *ochkoʻz* – och (secondary stress), koʻz (main stress), and so on. However, the English scholar G. Marchand states that a compound word in English can take a single main stress (*home-made*, *moth-eaten*, *spell-bound*, *frostbitten*, *homespun*, *heartfelt*, *heartbroken*) (The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 7th edition, 2005, 1230.) or, in some cases, two main stresses (*home-bred*, *custom-built*, *government-owned*, *factory-packed*), giving the above examples.

Orthographic Criterion. The spelling (orthography) of compound words in English is even more confusing than in Uzbek. While compound words in Uzbek are written in two ways: either separately or together, in English, they have three ways of being written, that is, they are written separately, with a hyphen, or together.

1. Compound words written separately: toy store, diving board;
2. Compound words written with a hyphen: air-brake, she-pony;

3. Compound words written together: mushroom, pickpocket, egghead. (Rahimova Sh. Sh., 2018, 45.)

The same can be said about compound nouns formed from nouns in English: Compound nouns written together are formed from two short-syllable nouns and are considered compound nouns used in English for a long time. Examples include: *housewife, lawsuit, wallpaper, basketball*. (The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 7th edition, 2005, 1025.) The features of writing compound nouns together in English also have certain norms. For example, when the verb "to break through" becomes a noun, it is written together: a breakthrough. If compound words appear in a sentence in a predicative (predicate) or attributive (adjective) function, they are written together or with a hyphen. Among English linguists, like Uzbek scholars, there are opinions that compound words should be written together. For example, "Compound adjectives, like compound nouns, may be solid or hyphenated or separate words understood as one. The passage of compound adjectives from separate-word to solid-word form occurs slowly but surely as the given word unit establishes itself more firmly. Farsighted was once far-sighted. In time, boy crazy likely will be boycrazy". (Foulke A., 1964, 62.)

Compound nouns written with a hyphen. In this case, compound nouns consisting of two or more words are separated by a hyphen. They may include affixes, articles, prepositions, and conjunctions: *house-builder, single-mindedness, rent-a-cop, mother-of-pearl*, etc. (Marchand Hans., 1969, 186-189.)

Compound nouns written separately. They are usually longer words, for example *distance learning, lawn tennis, player piano*, etc.

Morphological Criterion. This criterion is characterized by the connection of compound words without any suffixes. In this respect, such compound words are similar to compound words in Uzbek. The external features of compound words in German are also noted in three ways: a) the compatibility of the components; b) the sequence of the components; d) the syntactic relations between the components. The compatibility or sequence of words is based on the specific norms of the English language. Certain types of compound words can change the order of their

components. This applies only to parts of speech where the second component is an adjective or adverb. For example, oil-rich, man-made. Some compound words are distinguished from word combinations by the absence of auxiliary elements in their composition: *good-for-nothing*, *pie-in-the-sky*. (The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 7th edition, 2005, 1250.)

It is known that in English compound words, the thing or phenomenon being understood, although slightly related to the meaning of the word, is not organically related to the meanings expressed by those words. For example, the English compound word “**egghead**,” mentioned above, does not mean “egg-shaped head”, but rather refers to “*a very intelligent and clever person.*” In this case, if we turn to the Uzbek language, we can also find many such examples in our native language. As proof of our opinion, we will explain the word *xumkalla* (literally: jug-head). Under this example, we understand not “a person whose head resembles a jug,” but rather “a person with a low mind, *scatterbrained, blockhead*,” that is, “a person who is rather stupid.” Or the word *qovoqbosh* (literally: pumpkin-head) is not found in the explanatory dictionary, but it is widely used in our spoken language, and mainly, it refers to “*a person whose brain does not work.*” In Uzbek, just like in English, the composition method forms compound nouns:” *toshko ‘mir* (coal), *tuyaqush* (ostrich), *karnaygul* (trumpet flower), *oybolta* (crescent axe), *sadarayhon* (basil), *ko ‘kqarg ‘a* (blue crow), *qoraqurt* (black worm), *mingoyoq* (centipede), and others (Jumaniyozov A.J., Allaberganova F., Toshnazarova D.O., Polvanova N., 2023, 2.) The English language is the same in this regard, but they can be further complicated. For example, if we add the word ‘writer’ to the word ‘science fiction,’ a complex compound word is formed.

Now, if we turn to the main subject of our research, the term “bahuvrihi” and the essence of its use in the language, this term originates from the ancient Sanskrit language, and in old Hindi meant “much rice” or “rice field”. Bahuvrihis are morphologically compound words.

Indians divide compound words into “4 main grammatical groups (**tatpurusha, bahuvrihi, dvandva, avyayibhava**)”. (Barrow T., 1976, 208.) As can

be seen from the classification, bahuvrihi occupies a leading position among compound words. “In European linguistics, especially in English and German linguistics, bahuvrihis are considered a type of determinative (attributive) compound words, and they denote compound words related to the human appearance, the naming of his person.” (Bukovskaya M. I., 2016, 2.) It is known that determinative compound words consist of two components, one of which defines and explains the specific characteristics of the other. Taking into account that the above-mentioned rule is not absolute, “the components of a compound word (determiner and determined) can change their places according to the meaning and essence of their use, that is, they can appear as *nozikbel* - *belinozik* (slender-waisted).” (Rahimova Sh. Sh., 2017, 30.) The difference between bahuvrihi and other compound words is that the naming is directed at people, and the meaning of the person expressed through it takes on a figurative - metaphoric-metonymic character, that is, under these compound words, most often, a specific aspect, feature, or distinguishing characteristic of a living person (human) is noted. The shift in meaning can also be expressed through synecdoches (expressing the whole through a part). The naming is concrete, and the meaning given through the name is figurative: *olako* ‘z (literally: motley-eyed) - the motley color of a person’s eyes is concrete, a clearly visible thing, that is, the white part of the eye is more, the iris is somewhat raised - large, big eyes, but the understanding of a certain person through these eyes (the whole person through a part) leads to a shift in meaning. “*Qirg’iyburun*” (a person whose nose resembles a hawk’s, is named through the nose), *shalpangquloq* (named a whole person with the word ear because of the ear’s larger size than normal), *chalishoyoq* (his owner is named through his crooked legs), and others. In all the above examples, attention is drawn to a part of a person’s body, that is, a whole is expressed through a part (synecdoche).” (Rahimova Sh. Sh., 2017, 30.)

Based on the shift in meaning (metonymy), it is not the specific lexical meanings of the compound word components understood, but rather their figurative meaning. For example, under the bahuvrihi “**xumkalla**” (literally: jug-head), “*a stupid person*” is understood. Although “xum” (jug) and “kalla” (head), the jug

being a container, and the head being a body part, come to mind figuratively, their dictionary meanings cannot be the basis for this compound word. In this sense, in communication, bahuvrihis are widely used to describe a **person's characteristic traits** (*toshbag'ir* - hard-hearted, *ochko'z* - greedy, *shirinsuxan* - sweet-spoken), **appearance** (*olako'z* - motley-eyed, *kaltasoch* - short-haired), **inner feelings** (*alamzada* - grief-stricken, *jabrdiida* - oppressed), **clothing** (*kaltayubka* - short skirt, *uzunko'ylak* - long dress), **body parts** (*soch* - hair, *ko'z* - eye, *quloq* - ear, *oyoq* - leg, *qo'l* - hand, etc., *jigargo'sha* - darling, *yolg'izqo'l* - one-handed), **habits** (*ishbuzar* - troublemaker, *ikkiyuzlamachi* - hypocrite),” (O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati., 2006, 1-5-jildlar) *worldview, character, mood, attitude towards others (a person's behavior, character in life, in the family, at the place of study or work, on the street, in public places), in general, to describe a person's characteristic abilities*. Likewise, a bahuvrihi differs from other compound words in that the thing, phenomenon, and person being understood through it, although slightly (partially) related to the meaning of the word components that formed the bahuvrihi, does not have a close connection with the meanings expressed by these words, because the bahuvrihi “**ochko'z**” (greedy) does not have a direct connection with hunger or eyes, but the connection is considered indirect. Indeed, hunger means that a person's stomach has a strong need for food products. However, a greedy person's stomach may be full. In this sense, this word, in most cases, refers to “*a person who cannot get enough of eating, who cannot control his desires, who is corrupt or obsessed with something and shows excessive greed.*”

As an analogous example, the meanings expressed by the “**kaltadum**” (literally: short-tailed) linguistic unit - bahuvrihi - are also distinguished by their uniqueness. This compound word, in its direct meaning, refers to “a short-tailed animal” (short-tailed donkey, short-tailed dog), while in a figurative sense, it means “a European-style woman wearing short clothes. For example, *U shahardan kelgan kaltadum, domlani boshini aylantirib, unga tegib oldi.* (Sh. Rizo, *Qor yog'di – izlar bosildi.*) (The short-tailed woman who came from the city teased the mullah and made fun of him.)” (Rahimova Sh. Sh., 2017, 35.) If we explain the examples given

above based on the rules we recommend regarding determinative compound words, if a short-tailed donkey or dog is understood under this linguistic unit, it is more appropriate to write it separately (*kaltadum it - short-tailed dog, kaltadum eshak - short-tailed donkey*), that is, as a word combination, and not together. Because if it is written together, it expresses a figurative meaning, naming a third thing-phenomenon (not a dog, but a woman). The original meaning of the word “bo‘tako‘z” is “an annual weed belonging to the Compositae family, with purple or bluish flowers - bo‘tagul.” **As a bahuvrihi, it** means *“beautiful, bright eyes resembling the eyes of a camel calf and a person (woman) with such eyes”*: “O‘lan aytib o‘tirgan bo‘tako‘zim, Bari qizdan yaxshisan yolg‘iz o‘zing. (“Oq olma, qizil olma” folk song). Here, the girl’s eyes are compared to the eyes of a camel calf, and on this basis, the meaning is transferred and a bahuvrihi is formed.” (O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati., 2006, 1-5-jildlar)

CONCLUSION

This study compared bahuvrihis (a type of compound word with a figurative meaning) in English and Uzbek, looking at how they are formed, what they mean, and how we classify them. We found both similarities and differences. Both languages use bahuvrihis to describe people figuratively, but the specific types of descriptions and how often they are used vary. A major problem we discovered is that it is often unclear whether a word combination in Uzbek is actually a single compound word or just two separate words used together. The main Uzbek dictionary sometimes treats the same word combination in different ways, which makes things confusing. This problem is less common in English. We also looked at how these compound words are written and pronounced. English has more variation in how bahuvrihis are written (sometimes together, sometimes with a hyphen, sometimes separate), while Uzbek is more consistent. The languages also pronounce the words differently, especially where the emphasis falls. These differences in writing and pronunciation can affect how we understand the words.

In short, our research shows how Bahuvrihis work in both English and Uzbek, but also reveals a big gap in how we understand and describe compound words in

Uzbek. Because it is hard to tell which word combinations in Uzbek are true compound words, we need more research and better rules for classifying them. This will not only improve our understanding of Uzbek, but also help us understand how compound words work in general across different languages. Future studies could look at more examples, explore how culture influences the meaning of these words, and create clear rules for classifying Uzbek compound words. This would significantly improve our understanding of this interesting part of language.

REFERENCES

1. Abdurahmonov, G'.A. (1957). *Uzbek language grammar*. (Vol. 1). Toshkent: Fan. 365p.
2. Barrow, T. (1976). *Sanskrit*. Moscow: Progress. 600p.
3. Bauer, L. (2004). *English Exocentric & Endocentric Compound*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 345p.
4. Bukovskaya, M.I. (2016). *Specifics of the Bahuvrihi compound nouns naming a person in the English and German languages*. Modern European Research. 456p.
5. *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. (2008). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Third edition. 1550p.
6. *Collins English Dictionary*. (2014). Collins UK. Second edition. 1260p.
7. Foulke, A. (1964). *English for everyone*. New York. 369p.
8. Greenbaum, S. (1991). *An Introduction to English Grammar*. Harlow: Longman. 465p.
9. Hojiyev, A. (1963). *Compound, paired and repetitive words in the Uzbek language*. Toshkent. 378p.
10. Jumaniozov, A.J., Allaberganova, F., Toshnazarova, D.O., & Polvanova, N. (2023). *The Peculiarities of Meaning Commonality of Compound Words and Word Combinations in the Uzbek and English Languages*. EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research. 7p. Vol8.
11. Levkovskaya, K.A. (1954). *Word formation*. Moscow: Moscow University Press. 630p.

12. Madaliyev, B. (1958). *Compound words in the modern Uzbek language*. Kokand State Pedagogical Institute. 370p.
13. Marchand, H. (1969). *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word Formation*. Munich: Beck. 685p.
14. *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati*. (2006). Toshkent: "O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi". 1-5 jildlar.
15. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Longman. 536p.
16. Rahimova, Sh. Sh. (2017). *Comparative study of bahuvrihi in English and Uzbek languages*. Urganch. Mater's dissertation. Urgench State university. 120p.
17. Rahimova, Sh. Sh. (2018). *Attributive compound words or bahuvrihis in the Uzbek language*. Toshkent. A manual. 192p.
18. Rundell, M. (2003). *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners of American English*. UK: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. New edition. 1700p.
19. Sweet, H. (1974). *A new English Grammar, Logical and Historical*. Oxford. 450p.
20. *The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (7th ed.). (2005). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2500p.